

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

BENJAMIN BARRY KRAMER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 3:15-cv-420-JPG-RJD
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court for case management purposes. Plaintiff Benjamin Barry Kramer has filed a *pro se* motion (Doc. 78), although he is represented by counsel. “[A] defendant who is represented by counsel relinquishes the right to file his own *pro se* submissions.” *United States v. Khatib*, 606 F. App’x 845, 847 (7th Cir. 2015) (citing *United States v. Williams*, 495 F.3d 810, 813 (7th Cir. 2007)). “Representation by counsel and self-representation are mutually exclusive.” *Cain v. Peters*, 972 F.2d 748, 750 (7th Cir. 1992). So-called “hybrid representation” confuses and extends matters at trial and in other proceedings. *See United States v. Oreya*, 263 F.3d 669, 672-73 (7th Cir. 2001). The Court may strike as improper any such *pro se* motions. *See, e.g., United States v. Gwiazdzinski*, 141 F.3d 784, 787 (7th Cir. 1998). The Court hereby **ORDERS** that Kramer’s *pro se* filing (Doc. 78) be **STRICKEN**. The Court notes that this is not the first time the Court has stricken *pro se* documents filed by Kramer while represented by counsel (Doc. 45, striking Docs. 42, 43 & 44). It **WARNS** Kramer that if he continues to make further *pro se* filings while he is represented by counsel, the Court will instruct the Clerk of Court to refuse to accept them for filing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 29, 2019

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
DISTRICT JUDGE